

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Favorable reconsideration of this application, as presently amended and in light of the following discussion, is respectfully requested.

Claims 1, 3, 5-9 and 40-51 are pending in the present application. Claims 1, 9 and 40 are amended by the present amendment. Support for the amended claims can be found in the original specification, claims and drawings.<sup>1</sup> No new matter is presented.

In the Office Action, the abstracted is objected to; and Claims 1, 3, 5-9 and 40-51 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph.

The Office Action objects to the abstract for exceeding 150 words in length. In response, a replacement abstract is provided, which conforms to the provisions of MPEP § 608.01(b).

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the objection to the abstract be withdrawn.

The Office Action rejects Claims 1, 3, 5-9 and 40-51 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, asserting that the specification fails to support the feature of “determining ... whether input content is to be protected by an encryption process when exchanged over the bus”. The Office Action, however, does cite various portions of the published version (U.S. 2005/0144465) of the specification<sup>2</sup>, noting that the specification “teaches encryption process indication of the input content when transferred over the bus ...” Therefore, in order to expedite allowance of the application, independent Claims 1, 9 and 40 are amended to recite “determining ... whether input content is to be protected by an encryption process when transferred exchanged over the bus”. As noted above, the specification provides clear support for this claimed feature.

---

<sup>1</sup> e.g. paragraphs [0199-0200], [0222], [0232], [0253-259], [0263], [0265], [0267], [0276], [0278] and [0282] of the published version of the originally filed disclosure (2005/0144465), and as noted in the outstanding Office Action.

<sup>2</sup> Id.

Application No. 10/500,851  
Reply to Office Action of December 30, 2009

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of Claims 1, 3, 5-9 and 40-51 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, be withdrawn.

Consequently, no further issues are believed to be outstanding in the present application, and the present application including Claims 1, 3, 5-9 and 40-51 is believed to be in condition for formal allowance. Therefore, a Notice of Allowance is earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner deem that any further action is necessary to place this application in even better form for allowance, the Examiner is encouraged to contact the undersigned representative at the below listed telephone number.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,  
MAIER & NEUSTADT, L.L.P.

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Bradley D. Lyle  
Attorney of Record  
Registration No. 40,073

Customer Number  
**22850**

Tel: (703) 413-3000  
Fax: (703) 413 -2220  
(OSMMN 07/09)

Andrew T. Harry  
Registration No. 56,959